Turkish Journal of Engineering



Turkish Journal of Engineering (TUJE) Vol. 2, Issue 3, pp. 98-106, September 2018 ISSN 2587-1366, Turkey DOI: 10.31127/tuje.374215 Research Article

INVESTIGATION OF Ni-Mn BASED SHAPE MEMORY ALLOY VARIATIONS TRANSFORMATION TEMPERATURES

Ece Kalay *1, Anıl Erdağ Nomer 2 and Mehmet Ali Kurgun 3

¹Mersin University, Engineering Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Mersin, Turkey ORCID ID 0000-0003-2470-7791 eecekalay@gmail.com

² Mersin University, Engineering Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Mersin, Turkey ORCID ID 0000 – 0002 – 8997 – 6936 erdagnomer@hotmail.com

³ Mersin University, Engineering Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Mersin, Turkey ORCID ID 0000 - 0001 - 5565 - 1351 malikurgun@gmail.com

* Correspondi	ing Author	
Received: 03/01/2018	Accepted: 25/02/2018	

ABSTRACT

Shape memory alloys' usage frequency and areas are increased day to day. It is seen the different type and different characteristics in many industrial areas. Therefore, shape memory alloys, which are intelligent materials, are very fast to develop. The NiTi alloys, from these alloy types, are most commonly used due to their low hysteresis range and biocompatibility. But production costs and difficulties have led, investigators to investigate different alloy types. Shape memory alloys which produced with possibly cheaper elements, examined in researchers with looking at their transformation temperatures.

Keywords: Dsc, NiTi, Shape Memory Alloys

1. INTRODUCTION

Shape memory alloys (SMA) are materials known as intelligent metals from the past to present day. In the past, SMA's found in various composition ratios of constrained elements are alloyed with many elemental ingredients now (Canbay, 2017). SMA's shed light on future systems and applications at a high level. The technologies that will be developed with unique features will provide great advantages and their usage will be necessary. High strength, biocompatibility, high wear resistance, high corrosion resistance, working in high temperature and pressure, elasticity ductility etc. intelligent metal alloys are made depending on the needs of the sectors. Healthcare field, defense, and military fields, mechanical systems, automotive sectors etc. (Canbay et al., 2014; Canbay, 2017; Canbay et al., 2017; Canbay et al., 2018). SMA's are required to be developed and used in the fields. Producing SMA's according to the needs of the areas to be used will be the best course of approachment. In order to meet the requirements of the application areas of SMA materials, the alloys must be full-featured and very diverse. Once the SMA's are approached, technology and sectors will be advantageous and the work on these intelligent materials will become more important. The SMA's are a very valuable issue for the Research & Development area. Considering the advantages and convenience of intelligent materials, it is a bright field of materials that many industries in the manufacturing and the business world will not spare their investments and supports (Eskil et al., 2015). SMA's have a certain high temperature phase and low temperature phase according to their element proportion that they contain. The high temperature phase is called the austenite phase, the low temperature phase is called the martensite phase. According to the phase temperature limits, it is determined at which temperature degree the shape memory conversion. This phase change is due to solid-state phase change. In general, the memory-trained shape will talk about memory formation; The SMA material is subjected to shape training. This is another issue that needs to be addressed in more detail (Ozkul et al., 2017). However, in the rough description of the work, the shape desired to be taken into memory is usually placed in a mold and heated to a high temperature austenite phase under tension. The alloyed material is converted to the low temperature martensite phase by shock cooling after heating to the austenite phase (Aldas et al., 2014). This cycle is repeated according to the type of material and the methods have differed one-way or two-way. After this process, the SMA will save it in the memory, which is determined in advance of the applied processes. After this step, heat, stress, or both subjected to the plastic deformation that has been exposed and the shape changes back to the SMA as it was recorded in the memory when heated from high to the high temperature austenite phase. It takes its place in the group of intelligent materials (Canbay et al., 2014). It has been stated that the SHA's have various advantageous properties according to the proportion of the elements they contain. Today, many test and screening systems are used in determining these properties. The most common of these is the differential scanning calorimetry (DSC). The DSC test is an important test for determining the temperature points and boundaries of the austenite and martensite phases, which are very important in the

memory acquisition of SMA's. The results of DSC scanning of various alloys of elements such as nickel, manganese, gallium, iron, aluminum, and tin have been examined in the literature review. The start and finish temperatures of the austenite and martensite phases were determined. The effect of element contents on phase transformation temperatures was investigated (Aldas *et al.*, 2016).

The austenite-initiation temperature (As) is the temperature at which this transformation begins, and the austenite-final temperature (A_f) is the temperature at which this transformation is complete. When the SMA heats up, the contract starts and returns to its original state. This conversion is possible even at high applied loads and, therefore, results in a high energy density of the trigger. During the cooling process, the transformation starts at the martensite starting temperature (Ms) and completes when the martensite reaches the finishing temperature (Mf) (Buehler et al., 1963). Martensite is called the highest temperature M_d that can be caused by residual stress, and when it is above this temperature, SMA permanently deforms like ordinary metallic materials (Duerig et al., 1994). These deforming effects, known as SMA and pseudo elasticity (or super elasticity), can be categorized according to three-dimensional memory properties:

- One-way shape memory effect (OWSME): The unidirectional SMA (SMA) maintains a deformed condition after removing an external force and then returns to its original state upon heating.
- Two-way shape memory effect (TWSME) or reversible SME: In addition to the one-sided effect, bi-directional SMA (TWSMA) can remember both high and low temperature shape. Often the recovery provided by OWSMA for the same material (Schroeder *et al.*, 1977; Huang *et al.*, 2000) yields about half of the water, and this stress tends to deteriorate quickly, especially at high temperatures (Ma *et al.*, 2010). For this reason, OWSMA offers a more reliable and economical solution (Stöckel 1995).
- Pseudo elasticity (PE) or Super elasticity (SE): The SMA returns to its original shape after applying the mechanical load without the need for any thermal activation at temperatures between A_f and M_d.

In addition to the TWSME material above, the prejudicial OWSMA actuator can also function as a 'mechanical TWSME' at a macroscopic (structural) level: more robust, reliable, and widely applied in many engineering applications (Sun et al., 2012). This feature is important and should be considered carefully when selecting SMA materials for targeted applications. For example, a small hysteresis is needed for applications where rapid movement is necessary (robotic applications) (Liu, 2010). The physical and mechanical properties of some SMAs also vary between these two phases, such as Young's modulus, electrical resistance, thermal conductivity, and thermal expansion coefficient (Mihálcz, 2001; Mertmann et al., 2008; Sreekumar et al., 2009). The austenite structure is rigid and has a high Young's modulus. The martensite structure is softer. It can easily deform with the external load (Hodgson et al., 1990; Mihálcz, 2001).

There are three varieties of SMA. These alloys are listed in the literature as NiTi, copper based and iron

based. The most capable of these alloy types is NiTi alloys. Because these alloy types have biocompatibility, they are used in many fields, especially in the field of medicine. Copper-based SMA is the closest to this type of alloy. But there is no popular. Iron-based SHA is the weakest type in this group because they have high hysteresis. In our study, the data of alloy types which may be alternative to NiTi-based SMA will be examined. The temperature transformation points of the austenite and martensite phases of the samples were determined and analyzed on the table and the thermal properties of the shape memory alloys were obtained. All text should be left and right justified. Footnotes and underlines are not allowed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The starting and ending temperatures of the austenite high temperature phase and the martensite low temperature phase are determined and tabulated in the literature review. The bibliographic numbers of the literature search of the thermal values of SMA's are listed at the beginning of the table as (Kainuma *et al.*, 1996; Jiang *et al.*, 2002; Jiang *et al.*, 2003; Wu *et al.*, 2003; Koho *et al.*, 2004; Lanska *et al.*, 2004; Glavatskyy *et al.*, 2006; Koyama *et al.*, 2006; Babita *et al.*, 2007; Santos *et al.*, 2008; Aksoy *et al.*, 2009; Wu *et al.*, 2011; Zheng *et al.*, 2011; Turabi *et al.*, 2016; Caputo *et al.*, 2017; Mostafaei *et al.*, 2017). The transformation temperatures obtained by different element contributions of Ni and Mnbased SMA materials are shown in Table 1.

2.1. Evaluation of Literature Review

In the direction of information from the source if we evaluate the change of austenite and martensite starting end temperature points by changing atomic ratios of nickel, manganese and aluminum elements, In the first sample, nickel and manganese were alloyed at 50 percent and specific temperature points were obtained. It has been observed that the austenite and martensite phase change temperatures are lowered when aluminum is added to this alloy and the manganese proportion is reduced (with the nickel ratio being kept constant). It is observed that when the aluminum ratio is kept constant and the nickel ratio is increased and the manganese ratio is decreased, the phase change temperatures are increased (Kainuma *et al.*, 1996).

Increasing the tin ratio in nickel, manganese and tin alloys has clearly reduced the phase conversion temperature (Koyama *et al.*, 2006; Santos *et al.*, 2008; Zheng *et al.*, 2011; Turabi *et al.*, 2016).

Nickel, manganese and antimony triple alloys have been investigated, and when the antimony ratio in the alloy is reduced, the transformation temperatures of the austenite and martensite phases have increased at a high rate. As a result of this observation, antimony addition reduces the high conversion temperatures (Aksoy *et al.*, 2009).

Nickel, manganese, and gallium ternary alloys were added to the dysprosium element and the effects on the temperature values were observed. When the dysprosium element increased, the phase transformation temperatures increased (Babita *et al.*, 2007).

Nickel, manganese, gallium triple alloy system is added to the silicium element. As the silicium ratio increased, the phase transformation temperatures decreased. When cobalt element is added instead of silicium, cobaltite phase transformation temperatures are lowered in the same way and the austenite and martensite start-finish transformation temperatures are increased by increasing the nickel ratio (Glavatskyy *et al.*, 2006).

Ref.	Ni	Mn	Ga	Fe	In	Si	Co	Dy	Al	Sn	Sb	In	Co	Ms	M_{f}	As	Af
	(at.%)	(°C)	(°C)	(°C)	(°C)												
	50,19	24,71	25,1											-118,5	-126,6	-106	-85
	50,69	23,07	26,24											-146,1	-148,5	-142	-132
	50,33	23,87	25,8											-116,2	-151,3	-132	-124
	50,33	24,38	25,29											-115,5	-129,5	-100	-88
	50,49	24,22	25,28											-76,5	-89,4	-65	-50
	50,28	24,77	24,96											-79,3	-86,6	-69	-60
	50,34	24,8	24,86											-69,3	-80,8	-60	-50
	50,36	24,88	24,75											-65,2	-85,3	-58	-45
	50,56	24,57	24,87											-70,1	-87,5	-59	-43
	50,61	24,84	24,55											-41,9	-58,2	-38	-22
	50,41	25,26	24,33											-55,7	-72,2	-47	-36
	51,56	23,43	25,02											-33,9	-50,4	-23	-9
	51,12	24,3	24,58											-48,8	-61,4	-47	-32
	51,93	23,07	25,01											-32,9	-47,8	-22	-5
(Wu and Yang, 2003)	50,98	24,83	24,19											-27,5	-38,5	-17	-6
	50,4	25,85	23,75											-33,1	-45,4	-24	-16
	51,27	24,49	24,24											-16,5	-33,4	-8	12
	51,38	24,81	23,81											-2	-12,2	4	20
	51,19	25,2	23,73											12,5	-17	16	35
	52,84	22,44	24,72											2,7	-13,8	14	28
	53,23	21,85	24,92											7,1	-4,3	20	31
	50,46	26,74	22,8											-7,8	-19,3	6	13
	51,71	24,84	23,45											22,9	5,3	24	40
	50,39	27,77	21,84											26	15,7	30	42
	52,29	24,59	23,12											37,6	30,4	46	50
	52,14	25,16	22,67											58,4	38,8	64	82
	52,54	24.78	22.68											59.4	41,4	53	73
	52,63	24,73	22,64											54,5	40	58	74
	55,78	19,52	24,7											92,2	74,8	102	120

Table 1. Transformation temperatures obtained by different element contributions of Ni and Mn based shape memory alloy materials

508 28.7 20.6 N N N N N 66 38.8 47.7 75.6 52.84 24.82 22.34 N </th <th></th>															
52.8 24.8 24.4 N N N N N N 77.6 55.8 82 100 53.26 24.68 22.06 N <t< td=""><td></td><td>50,48</td><td>28,87</td><td>20,65</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>66</td><td>36,8</td><td>47</td><td>76</td></t<>		50,48	28,87	20,65								66	36,8	47	76
53.45 24.07 22.48 77.6 55.8 82 04 53.26 24.68 22.06 1007 6.67 100 121 50.37 29.79 19.84 1007 6.67 100 121 50.37 29.79 19.84 114.7 80.6 124 135 53.17 25.27 10.0 118.5 178.6 202 201 (Jiang et al. 2002) 53 25 22 109 97 116 134 (Jiang et al. 2007) 50 29 20.5 0.5 71.2 66.2 71 76 (Babita et al. 2007) 48 29 20 2 </td <td></td> <td>52,84</td> <td>24,82</td> <td>22,34</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>74,3</td> <td>54,3</td> <td>68</td> <td>88</td>		52,84	24,82	22,34								74,3	54,3	68	88
53.6 24.8 22.06 N N N N N N 1007 66.7 100 121 53.07 29.79 19.84 N N N N 80 98 53.04 24.56 21.82 N N N N 80.5 98 53.04 24.56 21.82 N N N N 114.7 80.6 124 133 137 51.1 25 22 N N N N N 114.7 80.6 124 133 137 (liang et al. 2007) 53 22 25 N N N N 100 71.4 60.7 116 134 (liang et al. 2007) 53 22 25 N N N 10.1 N 16.1 58.9 63.7 71.4 66.7 71.4 66.2 71.4 76.9 78.9 72.8 71.6 80.8		53,45	24,07	22,48								77,6	55,8	82	104
53,64 24,56 21,82 0 0 0 82,2 63,5 80 98 53,64 24,56 21,82 0 0 0 114,7 80.6 124 133 53,71 25,77 21,02 0 0 0 158,5 17,12 143 17,7 64,15 24,88 20,97 0 0 0 185,3 178,6 202 217 (liang et al., 2003) 53 25 22 0 0 0,1 0 0 4 4 4 2 16 (Babin et al., 2007) 53 29 20,9 0 0 0,1 0 0.61 58,9 63 71 (Babin et al., 2007) 48 29 20,9 0 0 0,1 0 75,9 28,2 76 80 85 49,9 29 19 0 0 1 0 126,2 16,3 124 <td< td=""><td></td><td>53,26</td><td>24,68</td><td>22,06</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>100,7</td><td>66,7</td><td>100</td><td>121</td></td<>		53,26	24,68	22,06								100,7	66,7	100	121
53,64 24,56 21,82 114,7 80,6 124 133 53,17 25,27 21,02 158,5 117,2 143 177 64,15 24,88 20,7 188,5 178,6 202 21 (liang et al., 2003) 53 25 22 109 97 116 134 (liang et al., 2003) 53 22 25 0,1 66,1 58,9 63 71 (Babita et al., 2007) 50 29 20,5 0,5 71,2 66,2 71 76 (Babita et al., 2007) 48 29 20 1 16 339 38 52 52 (Babita et al., 2007) 28,1 26 130 318 <td></td> <td>50,37</td> <td>29,79</td> <td>19,84</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>82,2</td> <td>63,5</td> <td>80</td> <td>98</td>		50,37	29,79	19,84								82,2	63,5	80	98
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		53,64	24,56	21,82								114,7	80,6	124	135
Image and and a constraint of the second s		53,71	25,27	21,02								158,5	117,2	143	177
(fiang et al. 2002) 53 25 22 0 0 0 109 97 116 134 (fiang et al., 2003) 53 22 25 0 0 0 0 4 -14 2 16 (Babita et al., 2007) 50 29 20,5 0 0,5 0 71,2 66,2 71 76 (Babita et al., 2007) 48 29 20 0 0 1 0 75,9 -28,2 76 80 49 29 19 0 2 0 10 20 116 133 124 132 47,9 26,1 26 0 0 2 0 138 38 52 25 49,7 28,7 21,6 0 0 0 38 34 41 47 50,5 28,8 21,6 0,5 0 17 12 20 25 5 3 32		54,15	24,88	20,97								185,3	178,6	202	217
(fiang et al. 2003) 53 22 25 <th<< td=""><td>(Jiang et al., 2002)</td><td>53</td><td>25</td><td>22</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>109</td><td>97</td><td>116</td><td>134</td></th<<>	(Jiang et al., 2002)	53	25	22								109	97	116	134
Babita et al., 2007) 50 29 20,9 0 0,1 0 66,1 58,9 63 71 (Babita et al., 2007) 50 29 20,5 0 0 1 0 71,2 66,2 71 76 (Babita et al., 2007) 48 29 20 0 0 1 0 75,9 228,2 76 80 49 29 20,1 26 0 0 2 0 0 16,3 124 132 47,9 26,1 26 0 0 0 332 30 38 41 50,5 28,2 21,3 0 0 0 0 38 34 41 47 50,5 28,2 21,6 0,5 0 0 0 17 12 20 25 50 28,8 19,8 0 1 0 0 0 17 12 26 10 <t< td=""><td>(Jiang et al., 2003)</td><td>53</td><td>22</td><td>25</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-4</td><td>-14</td><td>2</td><td>16</td></t<>	(Jiang et al., 2003)	53	22	25								-4	-14	2	16
(Babita et al., 2007) 50 29 20,5 0,5 71,2 66,2 71 76 48 29 20 1 75,9 -28,2 76 80 49 29 19 2 126,2 116,3 124 132 49,7 28,7 21,6 38 34 41 47 50,5 28,2 21,3 38 34 41 47 51,4 27,2 21,4 38 34 41 47 60,4 28,8 21,6 0,5 78 72 80 86 60,4 28,8 10,6 1 <		50	29	20,9					0,1			66,1	58,9	63	71
(Galana et al., 2007) 48 29 20 1 1 1 75,9 -28,2 76 80 49 29 19 0 2 0 126,2 116,3 124 132 47,9 26,1 26 0 0 39 38 52 52 49,7 28,7 21,6 0 0 0 38 34 41 47 50,5 28,2 21,3 0 0 0 38 34 41 47 51,4 27,2 21,4 0 0 0 0 78 72 80 86 49,9 28 21,6 0,5 0 0 0 17 12 20 25 50 28,8 20,6 0,6 0 0 28 10 36 30 32 36 11 10 14 11 10 14 11 10 11 10	(Debits at $al = 2007$)	50	29	20,5					0,5			71,2	66,2	71	76
49 29 19 2 126,2 116,3 124 132 47,9 26,1 26 39 38 52 52 49,7 28,7 21,6 32 30 38 41 50,5 28,2 21,3 38 34 411 47 51,4 27,2 21,4 38 34 41 47 50 28,2 21,4 17 12 20 25 36 28 1.0 .33 36 .49,6 27.7 20,6 2,1 .25 .5	(Babita <i>et ut.</i> , 2007)	48	29	20					1			75,9	-28,2	76	80
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 200) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		49	29	19					2			126,2	116,3	124	132
$ (Glavatskyy \ et \ al., 2006) \ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		47,9	26,1	26								39	38	52	52
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		49,7	28,7	21,6								32	30	38	41
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		50,5	28,2	21,3								38	34	41	47
$ (Glavatskyy \ et \ al., 2006) \ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		51,4	27,2	21,4								78	72	80	86
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		49,9	28	21,6			0,5					17	12	20	25
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		50	28,8	20,6			0,6					28	-10	-3	36
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		50,4	28,8	19,8			1					25	-5	3	32
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		49,6	27,7	20,6			2,1					-128	-136	-111	-103
$ (Glavatskyy et al., 2006) \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		48,6	24,8	22,9		3,4						6	-17	-3	16
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	(Glavatskyy et al., 2006)	51,7	28,5	15,6		4,2						-95	-105	-73	-70
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		46,6	25,8	26,8				1,7				-7	-12	-6	0
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		43,5	27,9	22,8				5,8				-56	-60	-51	-46
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		50	29	18,8				2,2				223	211	224	237
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		47,3	25,9	20,4	6,4							13	1	20	30
50,9 20,2 23,7 5,2 7 2 6 13 51,3 14,4 26,3 8 86 79 88 101 51,8 24,3 23,2 0,7 20,7 29 11 21 31 52,1 23 24,2 0,7 1 1 30 0 20 25		49,4	27,5	21,3	1,8							43	39	54	59
51,3 14,4 26,3 8 101 51,8 24,3 23,2 0,7 1 29 11 21 31 52,1 23 24,2 0,7 1 1 30 0 20 25		50,9	20,2	23,7	5,2							7	2	6	13
51,8 24,3 23,2 0,7 29 11 21 31 52,1 23 24,2 0,7 0 0 20 25		51,3	14,4	26,3	8							86	79	88	101
52,1 23 24,2 0,7 30 0 20 25		51,8	24,3	23,2	0,7							29	11	21	31
		52,1	23	24,2	0,7							30	0	20	25

	51,7	24,4	22,7	1,2					53	34	41	62
	47,3	30,3	20,3	2,1					53	32	42	61
	48,9	29	19,5	2,6					65	52	53	76
	48,8	29,2	20,1	1,9					45	27	49	64
	48,6	27,5	21,6	2,3					31	22	33	41
$(K_{\rm obs} {\rm st} {\rm st} 2004)$	48,9	26,2	22,6	2,3					57	45	58	70
(Kono <i>et ut.</i> , 2004)	49,4	27,9	20,3						54	42	54	59
	50,2	27,4	21,1						61	50	63	77
	49,6	28,3	20,7						53	36	48	64
	50,1	28,2	20,9	0,8					44	28	40	64
	49,2	29,6	21,2						31	28	35	38
	52,2	27,3	20,6						132	112	102	122
	50,7	28,4	20,9						61	52	66	72
	50,7	28,3	21						57	50	65	70
	50,7	27,8	21,5						52	50	58	61
	50,6	28,5	20,9						60	58	66	68
	50	29,8	20,2						71	67	74	78
	50	28,9	21,1						48	38	47	57
	49,9	29,9	20,2						71	65	77	81
	49,7	29,1	21,2						38	36	46	48
	49,6	29,2	21,2						30	28	36	36
	49,2	30,6	20,2						55	50	60	64
(Lanska <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	49,1	30,7	20,2						51	48	59	62
	49	30,3	20,7						39	36	45	50
	48,5	30,3	21,2						29	26	32	35
	51	28,5	20,5						83	77	81	87
	50,5	29,4	20,1						78	70	75	84
	49,5	30,3	20,2						68	64	71	75
	48,8	31,4	19,8						64	60	65	69
	54,9	23,8	21,3						286	268	295	314
	54	24,7	21,3						224	214	225	237
	53,9	24,4	21,7						257	251	278	287
	53,7	26,4	19,9						250	239	265	273

	53,3	24,6	22,1								192	186	195	203
	52,9	25	22,1								75	71	81	90
	52,8	25,7	21,5								117	94	104	131
	52,7	26	21,3								161	143	151	173
	52,4	25,6	22								150	141	151	161
	52,3	27,4	20,3								125	118	130	135
	51,7	27,7	20,6								110	96	108	121
	51,5	26,8	21,7								120	101	107	127
	51,2	27,4	21,4								98	93	98	102
	51	28,7	20,3								106	93	103	112
	50,5	30,4	19,1								118	103	110	124
	47	33,1	19,9								53	50	56	58
(Santos et al., 2008)	50,55	36,33					13,12				-55	-66	-49	-41
(Wu et al., 2011)	37	50							10	3	-87	-120	-94	-61
(Turabi et al., 2016)	42,1	48,7					9,2				-6	-16	-6	4
	50	50									674	660	707	719
	50	46				4					589	567	593	608
	50	42				8					473	459	485	503
	50	38				12					341	285	304	368
(Kainuma <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	50	34				16					191	128	134	192
	50	30				20					-22	-34	-12	-4
	44	46				10					268	259	348	362
	45	40				15					116	81	94	119
	55	30				15					386	378	433	449
(Zheng et al., 2011)	49	39					12				-13	-34	1	22
(Koyama et al., 2006)	50	36					14				-53	-63	-33	-23
	50,3	35,9						13,8			3	-8	2	17
	50,2	36,6						13,2			4	-3	7	18
(Aksoy et al., 2009)	51,5	36						12,5			73	65	76	85
	50,3	39,6						10,1			171	95	107	184
	51,9	42,7						5,4			436	348	359	468
(Caputo and Solomon 2017)	49,5	27,8	22,7								36,9	17,1	33,9	57,6
(Mostafaei et al., 2017)	49,6	30,8	19,6								36	31,5	42	46,5

3. CONCLUSION

Shape memory alloys are defined undeniably positioned in the technology. However, in terms of production costs, it is necessary to search for alloy types that will become an alternative to high-grade alloys such as NiTi and to present the service of humanity. From this point of view, successful studies with elements such as manganese, which can be provided as cheaper than the titanium element in nickel-based SHA, have been investigated. It has been found that in the determined thermal phase temperature transformations, the alloys' high nickel, manganese and gallium ratios are largely determinative. As a result of these studies, a wide range of transformation temperatures have been identified and found to be open to Research & Development. These types of alloys that provide the wide range of conversion can respond to many needs.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, S., M. Acet, E. F. Wassermann, T. Krenke, X. Moya, L. Manosa, A. Planes and P. P. Deen (2009). "Structural properties and magnetic interactions in martensitic Ni-Mn-Sb alloys." *Philosophical Magazine*, Vol. 89, No. 22-24, pp. 2093-2109.

Aldas, K., M. Eskil and İ. Özkul (2014). "Prediction of A f temperature for copper based shape memory alloys." *Indian Journal of Engineering & Materials Science* Vol. 21. pp. 429-437.

Aldas, K. and I. Ozkul (2016). "Determination of the transformation temperatures of aged and low manganese rated Cu-Al-Mn shape memory alloys." *Journal of the balkan tribological association*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 56-65.

Babita, I., M. M. Raja, R. Gopalan, V. Chandrasekaran and S. Ram (2007). "Phase transformation and magnetic properties in Ni–Mn–Ga Heusler alloys." *Journal of alloys and compounds*, Vol. 432, No. 1, pp. 23-29.

Buehler, W. J., J. Gilfrich and R. Wiley (1963). "Effect of low-temperature phase changes on the mechanical properties of alloys near composition TiNi." *Journal of applied physics*, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 1475-1477.

Canbay, C. A. (2017). "Kinetic parameters and structural variations in Cu-Al-Mn and Cu-Al-Mn-Mg shape memory alloys." *AIP Conference Proceedings*, pp.120001.

Canbay, C. A., S. Ozgen and Z. K. Genc (2014). "Thermal and microstructural investigation of Cu–Al–Mn–Mg shape memory alloys." *Applied Physics A*, Vol. 117, No. 2, pp. 767-771.

Canbay, C. A. and İ. Özkul (2018). "Aging effects on transformation temperatures and enthalpies for TiNi alloy." *Turkish Journal of Engineering (TUJE)*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 7-11.

Canbay, C. A., A. Tekataş and İ. Özkul (2017). "Fabrication Of Cu-Al-Ni shape memory thin film by thermal evopration." *Turkish Journal of Engineering* (*TUJE*), Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 27-32.

Caputo, M. and C. Solomon (2017). "A facile method for producing porous parts with complex geometries from ferromagnetic Ni-Mn-Ga shape memory alloys." *Materials Letters*, Vol. 200, No., pp. 87-89.

Duerig, T. and A. Pelton (1994). "Ti-Ni shape memory alloys." *Materials properties handbook: titanium alloys*, Vol., No., pp. 1035-1048.

Eskil, M., K. Aldaş and İ. Özkul (2015). "Prediction of thermodynamic equilibrium temperature of Cu-based shape-memory smart materials." *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 134-142.

Glavatskyy, I., N. Glavatska, O. Söderberg, S.-P. Hannula and J.-U. Hoffmann (2006). "Transformation temperatures and magnetoplasticity of Ni–Mn–Ga alloyed with Si, In, Co or Fe." *Scripta materialia*, Vol. 54, No. 11, pp. 1891-1895.

Hodgson, D. E., W. Ming and R. J. Biermann (1990). "Shape memory alloys." *ASM International, Metals Handbook, Tenth Edition.*, Vol. 2, No., pp. 897-902.

Huang, W. and W. Toh (2000). "Training two-way shape memory alloy by reheat treatment." *Journal of materials science letters*, Vol. 19, No. 17, pp. 1549-1550.

Jiang, C., G. Feng, S. Gong and H. Xu (2003). "Effect of Ni excess on phase transformation temperatures of NiMnGa alloys." *Materials Science and Engineering: A*, Vol. 342, No. 1, pp. 231-235.

Jiang, C., G. Feng and H. Xu (2002). "Co-occurrence of magnetic and structural transitions in the Heusler alloy Ni 53 Mn 25 Ga 22." *Applied physics letters*, Vol. 80, No. 9, pp. 1619-1621.

Kainuma, R., K. Ishida and H. Nakano (1996). "Martensitic transformations in NiMnAl β phase alloys." *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A*, Vol. 27, No. 12, pp. 4153-4162.

Koho, K., O. Söderberg, N. Lanska, Y. Ge, X. Liu, L. Straka, J. Vimpari, O. Heczko and V. Lindroos (2004). "Effect of the chemical composition to martensitic transformation in Ni–Mn–Ga–Fe alloys." *Materials Science and Engineering: A*, Vol. 378, No. 1, pp. 384-388.

Koyama, K., K. Watanabe, T. Kanomata, R. Kainuma, K. Oikawa and K. Ishida (2006). "Observation of field-induced reverse transformation in ferromagnetic shape memory alloy Ni 50 Mn 36 Sn 14." *Applied physics letters*, Vol. 88, No. 13, pp. 132505.

Lanska, N., O. Söderberg, A. Sozinov, Y. Ge, K. Ullakko and V. Lindroos (2004). "Composition and temperature dependence of the crystal structure of Ni–Mn–Ga alloys." *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 95, No. 12, pp. 8074-8078. Liu, Y. (2010). "Some factors affecting the transformation hysteresis in shape memory alloys." *Chen HR*, *editor*, Vol., No., pp. 361-369.

Ma, J., I. Karaman and R. D. Noebe (2010). "High temperature shape memory alloys." *International Materials Reviews*, Vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 257-315.

Mertmann, M. and G. Vergani (2008). "Design and application of shape memory actuators." *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, Vol. 158, No. 1, pp. 221-230.

Mihálcz, I. (2001). "Fundamental characteristics and design method for nickel-titanium shape memory alloy." *Periodica Polytechnica. Engineering. Mechanical Engineering*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 75.

Mostafaei, A., K. A. Kimes, E. L. Stevens, J. Toman, Y. L. Krimer, K. Ullakko and M. Chmielus (2017). "Microstructural evolution and magnetic properties of binder jet additive manufactured Ni-Mn-Ga magnetic shape memory alloy foam." *Acta Materialia*, Vol. 131, No., pp. 482-490.

Ozkul, I., C. A. Canbay, F. Aladağ and K. Aldaş (2017). "The effect of the aging period on the martensitic transformation and kinetic characteristic of at% Cu68. 09A126. 1Ni1. 54Mn4. 27 shape memory alloy." *Russian Journal of Non-Ferrous Metals*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 130-135.

Santos, J. D., T. Sanchez, P. Alvarez, M. Sanchez, J. L. Sánchez Llamazares, B. Hernando, L. Escoda, J. J. Suñol and R. Varga (2008). "Microstructure and magnetic properties of Ni 50 Mn 37 Sn 13 Heusler alloy ribbons." *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 103, No. 7, pp. 07B326.

Schroeder, T. and C. Wayman (1977). "The two-way shape memory effect and other "training" phenomena in Cu Zn single crystals." *Scripta metallurgica*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 225-230.

Sreekumar, M., T. Nagarajan and M. Singaperumal (2009). "Application of trained NiTi SMA actuators in a spatial compliant mechanism: Experimental investigations." *Materials & Design*, Vol. 30, No. 8, pp. 3020-3029.

Stöckel, D. (1995). "The shape memory effectphenomenon, alloys and applications." *California*, Vol. 94539, No., pp. 1-13.

Sun, L., W. M. Huang, Z. Ding, Y. Zhao, C. C. Wang, H. Purnawali and C. Tang (2012). "Stimulus-responsive shape memory materials: a review." *Materials & Design*, Vol. 33, No., pp. 577-640.

Turabi, A., P. Lázpita, M. Sasmaz, H. Karaca and V. Chernenko (2016). "Magnetic and conventional shape memory behavior of Mn–Ni–Sn and Mn–Ni–Sn (Fe) alloys." *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, Vol. 49, No. 20, pp. 205002.

Wu, S. and S. Yang (2003). "Effect of composition on transformation temperatures of Ni-Mn-Ga shape

memory alloys." *Materials Letters*, Vol. 57, No. 26, pp. 4291-4296.

Wu, Z., Z. Liu, H. Yang, Y. Liu and G. Wu (2011). "Metamagnetic phase transformation in Mn 50 Ni 37 In 10 Co 3 polycrystalline alloy." *Applied Physics Letters*, Vol. 98, No. 6, pp. 061904.

Zheng, H., D. Wu, S. Xue, J. Frenzel, G. Eggeler and Q. Zhai (2011). "Martensitic transformation in rapidly solidified Heusler Ni 49 Mn 39 Sn 12 ribbons." *Acta Materialia*, Vol. 59, No. 14, pp. 5692-5699.

Copyright © Turkish Journal of Engineering (TUJE). All rights reserved, including the making of copies unless permission is obtained from the copyright proprietors.